

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. All claims have been rejected.

The specification has been amended to correct an obvious error and claim 1 has been amended as is explained in greater detail below.

Claim Objections Addressed

All antecedent basis problems raised by the Examiner have been addressed as required. No new matter has been added.

Claims Rejections under 35 USC § 102 Addressed

Claims 1-4 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Arimilli et al (US Patent No. 6,418,514). The rejection of claims 1 and 9 as amended under 35 USC 102(e) is respectfully traversed.

Arimilli et al teaches multiple cache operations that are concurrently outstanding in the system and multiple caches that exist in the system. It is deemed clear that the teachings of Arimilli et al are directed to multiple cache operations because the specification teaches the management of a queue. Further, it is deemed clear that the teachings of Arimilli et al are directed to problems associated particularly with multi-processor systems.

In contrast, the present invention is directed to a single processor computer system. The present invention is not directed of a queue of operations, simply because there never need be more than one. Further, a bus based transaction system cannot be deemed to be a queue as taught in Arimilli et al since (queues need two properties – multiplicity of items and ordering of those items, neither of which is a necessary condition for a system in which the teachings of the present invention are a solution.)

Claims 1 and 9, therefore, have been amended to claim a computer system having a single processor or processing unit, which is deemed to distinguish over Arimilli et al. The amendment to the preamble of claim 9 is deemed to be limiting of

the claim scope. Claims 1 and 9, as amended, are deemed to be allowable under 35 USC 102(e).

The remaining rejected claims 2-4 and 10-12 are also deemed to be allowable as being dependent upon allowable base claim 1 or claim 9.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103 Addressed

Claims 5, 6, 13, and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arimilli et al and Spencer (US Patent No. 6,295,582). Claims 7, 8, 15, and 16 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Arimilli et al and Jacobs (US Patent No. 6,047,358). The rejection of claims 5-8 and 13-16 under 35 USC 103 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5-8 and 13-16 are deemed to be allowable as being dependent upon allowable base claim 1 or 9, as amended.


Conclusion

In view of all of the above, claims 1-16 are believed to be allowable over the cited references and the case in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

Aug. 14, 2003


Peter J. Meza, No. 32,920
Hogan & Harrison LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5906 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax